

can scarcely consider him as competent to judge of its merits or demerits.

With regard *again* to the scientific characters of the animal as they are given in the body of the paper, Mr. Gray desiderates further information respecting "the teeth, the whiskers, the ears, and various other parts." But of "the teeth" I could say nothing, my description being taken from the stuffed specimens of the animal destitute of the crania; of "the whiskers," I stated that "the whiskers are brownish-black, five rows being present;" of "the ears," that "they are black, narrow and pointed, one inch in length, and situate 5 inches 6 lines from the tip of the snout;" and of the other parts and members of the animal I gave descriptions and measurements so detailed as might have exposed me to the risk of being considered needlessly prolix. In common with Mr. Gray, I regretted the absence of the crania, and professed to give the specific characters only "so far as my opportunities permitted."

But while my description was thus avowedly and necessarily defective—in regard more especially to the teeth and crania—I am happy to think that it is still amply sufficient to satisfy the leading and immediate object of Mr. Gray's inquiries, which is whether the Fur Seal is the same with his "*Leptonyx Wedellii*." Whatever else is done by my description, it at least establishes (as Mr. Gray himself observes), that the Fur Seal "is an Otary or Eared Seal." Now upon turning to the description of his "*Leptonyx Wedellii*" referred to by him, as contained in the 'Magazine of Natural History' for 1837, I find, according to the statement there given, that *it* belongs to a group which have "grinders with many roots, ears none, toes simple, soles and palms hairy." The Fur Seal then being "an Otary or Eared Seal," and the *Leptonyx Wedellii* having "ears none," how is it possible that they should be the same animal? It will be observed too, that the *Leptonyx Wedellii* has "soles and palms hairy," whereas my description of the Fur Seal bears, "the *under portion* of both extremities—to the extent of *two-thirds* of the anterior, and *nearly the whole* of the posterior—are *naked, being quite destitute of both hair and fur*." There are other marks of obvious distinction; but when it appears that the one seal is an Otary and the other not, it may justly be deemed superfluous to insist on any other distinctive features; and Mr. Gray's immediate purpose may be held to be sufficiently attained.—ROBERT HAMILTON.

CURIOUS HABIT OF EARTH-WORMS.

While staying at Whitley, near North Shields, Mr. Fryer pointed out to me that the worms (*Lumbrici*), which are abundant on the south

can scarcely consider him as competent to judge of its merits or demerits.

With regard *again* to the scientific characters of the animal as they are given in the body of the paper, Mr. Gray desiderates further information respecting "the teeth, the whiskers, the ears, and various other parts." But of "the teeth" I could say nothing, my description being taken from the stuffed specimens of the animal destitute of the crania; of "the whiskers," I stated that "the whiskers are brownish-black, five rows being present;" of "the ears," that "they are black, narrow and pointed, one inch in length, and situate 5 inches 6 lines from the tip of the snout;" and of the other parts and members of the animal I gave descriptions and measurements so detailed as might have exposed me to the risk of being considered needlessly prolix. In common with Mr. Gray, I regretted the absence of the crania, and professed to give the specific characters only "so far as my opportunities permitted."

But while my description was thus avowedly and necessarily defective—in regard more especially to the teeth and crania—I am happy to think that it is still amply sufficient to satisfy the leading and immediate object of Mr. Gray's inquiries, which is whether the Fur Seal is the same with his "*Leptonyx Wedellii*." Whatever else is done by my description, it at least establishes (as Mr. Gray himself observes), that the Fur Seal "is an Otary or Eared Seal." Now upon turning to the description of his "*Leptonyx Wedellii*" referred to by him, as contained in the 'Magazine of Natural History' for 1837, I find, according to the statement there given, that *it* belongs to a group which have "grinders with many roots, ears none, toes simple, soles and palms hairy." The Fur Seal then being "an Otary or Eared Seal," and the *Leptonyx Wedellii* having "ears none," how is it possible that they should be the same animal? It will be observed too, that the *Leptonyx Wedellii* has "soles and palms hairy," whereas my description of the Fur Seal bears, "the *under portion* of both extremities—to the extent of *two-thirds* of the anterior, and *nearly the whole* of the posterior—are *naked, being quite destitute of both hair and fur*." There are other marks of obvious distinction; but when it appears that the one seal is an Otary and the other not, it may justly be deemed superfluous to insist on any other distinctive features; and Mr. Gray's immediate purpose may be held to be sufficiently attained.—ROBERT HAMILTON.

CURIOUS HABIT OF EARTH-WORMS.

While staying at Whitley, near North Shields, Mr. Fryer pointed out to me that the worms (*Lumbrici*), which are abundant on the south

can scarcely consider him as competent to judge of its merits or demerits.

With regard *again* to the scientific characters of the animal as they are given in the body of the paper, Mr. Gray desiderates further information respecting "the teeth, the whiskers, the ears, and various other parts." But of "the teeth" I could say nothing, my description being taken from the stuffed specimens of the animal destitute of the crania; of "the whiskers," I stated that "the whiskers are brownish-black, five rows being present;" of "the ears," that "they are black, narrow and pointed, one inch in length, and situate 5 inches 6 lines from the tip of the snout;" and of the other parts and members of the animal I gave descriptions and measurements so detailed as might have exposed me to the risk of being considered needlessly prolix. In common with Mr. Gray, I regretted the absence of the crania, and professed to give the specific characters only "so far as my opportunities permitted."

But while my description was thus avowedly and necessarily defective—in regard more especially to the teeth and crania—I am happy to think that it is still amply sufficient to satisfy the leading and immediate object of Mr. Gray's inquiries, which is whether the Fur Seal is the same with his "*Leptonyx Wedellii*." Whatever else is done by my description, it at least establishes (as Mr. Gray himself observes), that the Fur Seal "is an Otary or Eared Seal." Now upon turning to the description of his "*Leptonyx Wedellii*" referred to by him, as contained in the 'Magazine of Natural History' for 1837, I find, according to the statement there given, that *it* belongs to a group which have "grinders with many roots, ears none, toes simple, soles and palms hairy." The Fur Seal then being "an Otary or Eared Seal," and the *Leptonyx Wedellii* having "ears none," how is it possible that they should be the same animal? It will be observed too, that the *Leptonyx Wedellii* has "soles and palms hairy," whereas my description of the Fur Seal bears, "the *under portion* of both extremities—to the extent of *two-thirds* of the anterior, and *nearly the whole* of the posterior—are *naked, being quite destitute of both hair and fur*." There are other marks of obvious distinction; but when it appears that the one seal is an Otary and the other not, it may justly be deemed superfluous to insist on any other distinctive features; and Mr. Gray's immediate purpose may be held to be sufficiently attained.—ROBERT HAMILTON.

CURIOUS HABIT OF EARTH-WORMS.

While staying at Whitley, near North Shields, Mr. Fryer pointed out to me that the worms (*Lumbrici*), which are abundant on the south

can scarcely consider him as competent to judge of its merits or demerits.

With regard *again* to the scientific characters of the animal as they are given in the body of the paper, Mr. Gray desiderates further information respecting "the teeth, the whiskers, the ears, and various other parts." But of "the teeth" I could say nothing, my description being taken from the stuffed specimens of the animal destitute of the crania; of "the whiskers," I stated that "the whiskers are brownish-black, five rows being present;" of "the ears," that "they are black, narrow and pointed, one inch in length, and situate 5 inches 6 lines from the tip of the snout;" and of the other parts and members of the animal I gave descriptions and measurements so detailed as might have exposed me to the risk of being considered needlessly prolix. In common with Mr. Gray, I regretted the absence of the crania, and professed to give the specific characters only "so far as my opportunities permitted."

But while my description was thus avowedly and necessarily defective—in regard more especially to the teeth and crania—I am happy to think that it is still amply sufficient to satisfy the leading and immediate object of Mr. Gray's inquiries, which is whether the Fur Seal is the same with his "*Leptonyx Wedellii*." Whatever else is done by my description, it at least establishes (as Mr. Gray himself observes), that the Fur Seal "is an Otary or Eared Seal." Now upon turning to the description of his "*Leptonyx Wedellii*" referred to by him, as contained in the 'Magazine of Natural History' for 1837, I find, according to the statement there given, that *it* belongs to a group which have "grinders with many roots, *ears* none, toes simple, soles and palms hairy." The Fur Seal then being "an Otary or Eared Seal," and the *Leptonyx Wedellii* having "*ears none*," how is it possible that they should be the same animal? It will be observed too, that the *Leptonyx Wedellii* has "*soles and palms hairy*," whereas my description of the Fur Seal bears, "the *under portion* of both extremities—to the extent of *two-thirds* of the anterior, and *nearly the whole* of the posterior—are *naked, being quite destitute of both hair and fur*." There are other marks of obvious distinction; but when it appears that the one seal is an Otary and the other not, it may justly be deemed superfluous to insist on any other distinctive features; and Mr. Gray's immediate purpose may be held to be sufficiently attained.—ROBERT HAMILTON.

CURIOUS HABIT OF EARTH-WORMS.

While staying at Whitley, near North Shields, Mr. Fryer pointed out to me that the worms (*Lumbrici*), which are abundant on the south

side of his gravel walk, just under the shade of the tuft, where the walks are seldom used, gather together in a head all the loose stones within 6 or 8 inches of their hole, and heap them over its opening, sometimes to a considerable height. The holes when the stones are removed are large, and there are often also a few straws projecting from them. I do not recollect to have observed any similar habit in the worm in the neighbourhood of London; they are probably a different species.—J. E. GRAY.

OCURRENCE OF *ATRIPLEX ROSEA*.

Atriplex rosea, lately added by Mr. Babington to the Flora of the Channel Islands, is I apprehend not uncommon on most of the coasts of England; it is mentioned in Dillenius's edition of Ray's Synopsis, as growing near Maldon, in Essex, and near Selsey, in Sussex, in both which counties I have known it more than fifty years, and having cultivated it, have always with Samuel Dale considered it as distinct from *Atriplex patula*, though in opposition to the great names of Ray, Petiver, Hudson, Smith, &c. I am much pleased now to find my opinion confirmed by that of so able an investigator of British plants as my friend Babington.—EDW. FORSTER.

THE ANIMAL OF *MODIOLUS DISCREPANS*.

The mantle lobes of this animal are free all round, except at the hinder edge, in the upper part of which they emit a short truncated contractile tube. The hinder part of the lower edges of the mantle, when the animal is expanded, is slightly produced, and folded on the edge of the shell. The foot is rather large and moveable, extensile, becoming strap-shaped, extended in front, with a small flattened disk at the end, and keeled along its lower edge. This foot is sometimes bent back to the hinder opening of the mantle lobes, but it is generally produced in front, and the animal uses the disk at the end of it to enable it to turn itself from side to side, and to place itself in an erect position when it walks by extending its foot to its utmost length, and thus advancing the shell and body along the whole extent of the foot at each move. It also creeps with the foot on the surface of the water, with the shell downwards like a *Cyclas*; and it has the power, like that genus, of crawling up the smooth surface of glass or china. When the animal slides on the surface of the water the gills can be distinctly seen; they extend quite to the base of the tube. I could not observe the course of the water in their shell, but in the young of the common *Modiolus* (*Modiolus barbatus*) it entered in currents, coming from all sides of the shell into the spaces between the two lobes of the mantle, in the middle of the in-

side of his gravel walk, just under the shade of the tuft, where the walks are seldom used, gather together in a head all the loose stones within 6 or 8 inches of their hole, and heap them over its opening, sometimes to a considerable height. The holes when the stones are removed are large, and there are often also a few straws projecting from them. I do not recollect to have observed any similar habit in the worm in the neighbourhood of London; they are probably a different species.—J. E. GRAY.

OCURRENCE OF *ATRIPLEX ROSEA*.

Atriplex rosea, lately added by Mr. Babington to the Flora of the Channel Islands, is I apprehend not uncommon on most of the coasts of England; it is mentioned in Dillenius's edition of Ray's Synopsis, as growing near Maldon, in Essex, and near Selsey, in Sussex, in both which counties I have known it more than fifty years, and having cultivated it, have always with Samuel Dale considered it as distinct from *Atriplex patula*, though in opposition to the great names of Ray, Petiver, Hudson, Smith, &c. I am much pleased now to find my opinion confirmed by that of so able an investigator of British plants as my friend Babington.—EDW. FORSTER.

THE ANIMAL OF *MODIOLUS DISCREPANS*.

The mantle lobes of this animal are free all round, except at the hinder edge, in the upper part of which they emit a short truncated contractile tube. The hinder part of the lower edges of the mantle, when the animal is expanded, is slightly produced, and folded on the edge of the shell. The foot is rather large and moveable, extensile, becoming strap-shaped, extended in front, with a small flattened disk at the end, and keeled along its lower edge. This foot is sometimes bent back to the hinder opening of the mantle lobes, but it is generally produced in front, and the animal uses the disk at the end of it to enable it to turn itself from side to side, and to place itself in an erect position when it walks by extending its foot to its utmost length, and thus advancing the shell and body along the whole extent of the foot at each move. It also creeps with the foot on the surface of the water, with the shell downwards like a *Cyclas*; and it has the power, like that genus, of crawling up the smooth surface of glass or china. When the animal slides on the surface of the water the gills can be distinctly seen; they extend quite to the base of the tube. I could not observe the course of the water in their shell, but in the young of the common *Modiolus* (*Modiolus barbatus*) it entered in currents, coming from all sides of the shell into the spaces between the two lobes of the mantle, in the middle of the in-

side of his gravel walk, just under the shade of the tuft, where the walks are seldom used, gather together in a head all the loose stones within 6 or 8 inches of their hole, and heap them over its opening, sometimes to a considerable height. The holes when the stones are removed are large, and there are often also a few straws projecting from them. I do not recollect to have observed any similar habit in the worm in the neighbourhood of London; they are probably a different species.—J. E. GRAY.

OCURRENCE OF *ATRIPLEX ROSEA*.

Atriplex rosea, lately added by Mr. Babington to the Flora of the Channel Islands, is I apprehend not uncommon on most of the coasts of England; it is mentioned in Dillenius's edition of Ray's Synopsis, as growing near Maldon, in Essex, and near Selsey, in Sussex, in both which counties I have known it more than fifty years, and having cultivated it, have always with Samuel Dale considered it as distinct from *Atriplex patula*, though in opposition to the great names of Ray, Petiver, Hudson, Smith, &c. I am much pleased now to find my opinion confirmed by that of so able an investigator of British plants as my friend Babington.—EDW. FORSTER.

THE ANIMAL OF *MODIOLUS DISCREPANS*.

The mantle lobes of this animal are free all round, except at the hinder edge, in the upper part of which they emit a short truncated contractile tube. The hinder part of the lower edges of the mantle, when the animal is expanded, is slightly produced, and folded on the edge of the shell. The foot is rather large and moveable, extensile, becoming strap-shaped, extended in front, with a small flattened disk at the end, and keeled along its lower edge. This foot is sometimes bent back to the hinder opening of the mantle lobes, but it is generally produced in front, and the animal uses the disk at the end of it to enable it to turn itself from side to side, and to place itself in an erect position when it walks by extending its foot to its utmost length, and thus advancing the shell and body along the whole extent of the foot at each move. It also creeps with the foot on the surface of the water, with the shell downwards like a *Cyclas*; and it has the power, like that genus, of crawling up the smooth surface of glass or china. When the animal slides on the surface of the water the gills can be distinctly seen; they extend quite to the base of the tube. I could not observe the course of the water in their shell, but in the young of the common *Modiolus* (*Modiolus barbatus*) it entered in currents, coming from all sides of the shell into the spaces between the two lobes of the mantle, in the middle of the in-

side of his gravel walk, just under the shade of the tuft, where the walks are seldom used, gather together in a head all the loose stones within 6 or 8 inches of their hole, and heap them over its opening, sometimes to a considerable height. The holes when the stones are removed are large, and there are often also a few straws projecting from them. I do not recollect to have observed any similar habit in the worm in the neighbourhood of London; they are probably a different species.—J. E. GRAY.

OCURRENCE OF *ATRIPLEX ROSEA*.

Atriplex rosea, lately added by Mr. Babington to the Flora of the Channel Islands, is I apprehend not uncommon on most of the coasts of England; it is mentioned in Dillenius's edition of Ray's Synopsis, as growing near Maldon, in Essex, and near Selsey, in Sussex, in both which counties I have known it more than fifty years, and having cultivated it, have always with Samuel Dale considered it as distinct from *Atriplex patula*, though in opposition to the great names of Ray, Petiver, Hudson, Smith, &c. I am much pleased now to find my opinion confirmed by that of so able an investigator of British plants as my friend Babington.—EDW. FORSTER.

THE ANIMAL OF *MODIOLUS DISCREPANS*.

The mantle lobes of this animal are free all round, except at the hinder edge, in the upper part of which they emit a short truncated contractile tube. The hinder part of the lower edges of the mantle, when the animal is expanded, is slightly produced, and folded on the edge of the shell. The foot is rather large and moveable, extensile, becoming strap-shaped, extended in front, with a small flattened disk at the end, and keeled along its lower edge. This foot is sometimes bent back to the hinder opening of the mantle lobes, but it is generally produced in front, and the animal uses the disk at the end of it to enable it to turn itself from side to side, and to place itself in an erect position when it walks by extending its foot to its utmost length, and thus advancing the shell and body along the whole extent of the foot at each move. It also creeps with the foot on the surface of the water, with the shell downwards like a *Cyclas*; and it has the power, like that genus, of crawling up the smooth surface of glass or china. When the animal slides on the surface of the water the gills can be distinctly seen; they extend quite to the base of the tube. I could not observe the course of the water in their shell, but in the young of the common *Modiolus* (*Modiolus barbatus*) it entered in currents, coming from all sides of the shell into the spaces between the two lobes of the mantle, in the middle of the in-